

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Contemporary Research and Perspectives in Biological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2669
Title of the Manuscript:	Micronucleus assay and Hematological parameters study to analyse the effect of microplastics and heavy metals on different fish species of the river kathajodi Cuttack Odisha
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it highlights the critical issue of water pollution in the Kathajodi River and its detrimental effects on aquatic life, particularly through the lens of hematological and genetic damage in fish. By utilizing the micronucleus assay as a biomarker for pollution, it provides a valuable methodology for assessing environmental health and the impact of anthropogenic activities on ecosystems. I appreciate this manuscript for its comprehensive approach to addressing a pressing environmental concern and its potential to inform future research and policy decisions aimed at mitigating pollution. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more detailed discussion on the implications of these findings for human health and broader ecological systems.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Micronucleus Assay and Hematological Parameters Study to Analyse the Effect of Microplastics and Heavy Metals on Different Fish Species of the River Kathajodi Cuttack Odisha" is somewhat lengthy and could be more concise. **Suggested Alternative Title**: "Impact of Microplastics and Heavy Metals on Fish Health in the Kathajodi River: A Micronucleus and Hematological Study"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a good overview of the study's focus on pollution in the Kathajodi River and its effects on fish health. However, it could benefit from the following suggestions: 1. **Add Specific Results**: Include key findings or quantitative data regarding the levels of pollutants and the extent of hematological/genetic damage observed in fish. 2. **Clarify Methodology**: Briefly mention the specific methods used for the micronucleus assay and hematological analysis to enhance clarity. 3. **Highlight Implications**: Emphasize the broader implications of the findings for environmental health and human safety to underscore the significance of the research. Incorporating these points would make the abstract more comprehensive and informative.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The appropriateness of subsections and structure in a manuscript typically depends on clarity, logical flow, and adherence to standard scientific formats. 1. **Logical Flow**: Ensure that the manuscript follows a clear progression from introduction, methods, results, to discussion and conclusion. 2. **Subsection Titles**: Use descriptive subsection titles that accurately reflect the content, making it easier for readers to navigate the manuscript. 3. **Consistency**: Maintain consistency in formatting and style throughout the manuscript to enhance readability. If these elements are well-executed, the structure is likely appropriate; otherwise, adjustments may be needed for clarity and coherence.	

[Review Form2](#)

<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through its use of established methodologies, such as the micronucleus assay and hematological analysis, which are widely recognized for assessing the impact of pollutants on aquatic organisms. The study effectively identifies specific pollutants, including microplastics and heavy metals, and correlates their presence with observed biological effects in fish, providing a clear link between environmental contamination and health outcomes. Additionally, the selection of multiple fish species as bioindicators enhances the robustness of the findings, allowing for a comprehensive understanding of the ecological impact. Overall, the rigorous approach to data collection and analysis supports the manuscript's technical soundness and scientific validity.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to cover a range of relevant studies, but their sufficiency and recency depend on the context of the research. While some references date back to the 1990s and early 2000s, it is essential to include more recent studies to reflect the latest advancements in the field of aquatic pollution and its effects on fish health.</p> <p>**Suggestions for Additional References**:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Recent studies on the effects of microplastics on aquatic ecosystems published in the last 5 years.2. Current reviews on heavy metal toxicity in fish and their implications for environmental health.3. Articles focusing on advancements in biomonitoring techniques for assessing water quality and aquatic life. <p>Incorporating these recent references would strengthen the manuscript's foundation and relevance in the current scientific discourse.</p>	

Review Form2

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article appear to be generally suitable for scholarly communication; however, there are areas that could benefit from improvement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity and Conciseness: Some sentences may be overly complex or lengthy, which can hinder readability. Simplifying these sentences would enhance clarity. Grammar and Syntax: A thorough proofreading is recommended to correct any grammatical errors or awkward phrasing that may detract from the professionalism of the manuscript. Technical Terminology: Ensure that technical terms are used correctly and consistently throughout the manuscript to maintain scientific accuracy. <p>Overall, with minor revisions for clarity and grammatical precision, the language quality can be significantly improved for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents valuable research on the impact of pollution on fish health, contributing to the understanding of environmental issues in aquatic ecosystems. Here are some optional comments for consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Visual Aids: Including figures or tables to summarize key data and findings could enhance the manuscript's clarity and impact, making it easier for readers to grasp complex information. Discussion of Limitations: A section discussing the limitations of the study and potential areas for future research would provide a more balanced perspective and highlight the ongoing nature of this field of study. Engagement with Current Literature: Engaging more deeply with recent literature on related topics could strengthen the manuscript's context and relevance, showcasing how this research fits into the broader scientific landscape. <p>Overall, these suggestions aim to enhance the manuscript's quality and its contribution to the field. This indicates a Major Revision is needed, as the manuscript presents valuable research but may require improvements in clarity, ethical considerations, and transparency regarding competing interests. Addressing these areas could enhance the manuscript's quality and its contribution to the field</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Vivek Chintada</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Sri Venkateswara University, India</p>